Distribution uniformity and delivery balance

Grant Kinkead
Independent Researcher, Melbourne, VIC, Australia
grant@kinkead.au

***Abstract*—Plants connected to a common nutrient reservoir may receive unequal quantities of nutrient solution because parallel delivery paths do not necessarily operate under identical hydraulic conditions. This paper examines distribution uniformity and delivery balance in hydroponic systems, focusing on the effects of pressure, elevation, path length, geometry, blockage and root-zone conditions. Evidence from emitter-discharge research shows that elevation and position along a lateral can affect discharge, while evidence from nutrient film technique systems identifies channel geometry, slope and root-mat obstruction as relevant influences. The central argument is that shared supply establishes a common source but does not guarantee equal delivery at each outlet or root zone. Uniformity should therefore be assessed through direct measurement of actual hydraulic behaviour, coupled with reporting of pathway conditions and measurement context. Literature on root-zone monitoring and controlled-environment uniformity further supports context-sensitive assessment rather than universal hardware prescriptions. The paper concludes that reliable delivery balance depends on identifying differences among parallel paths, monitoring change over time and validating uniformity in the operating system itself.**

I. Introduction

Distribution uniformity concerns the comparability of nutrient-solution delivery across connected channels, emitters or root zones. Delivery balance concerns how available flow is apportioned among those parallel paths. These concepts explain why plants attached to the same reservoir can nevertheless receive different amounts of nutrient solution. Research on drip fertigation directly links uneven emitter discharge with pressure variation, elevation head and position along a lateral [1]. A shared reservoir creates a common upstream source, but each outlet is reached through a particular pathway with its own hydraulic conditions. Consequently, equal connection to a supply does not establish equal delivery at every endpoint, and apparent system symmetry should not be treated as proof of hydraulic uniformity.

Pathway condition can change after installation, creating further sources of imbalance. Biofilms and suspended solids can contribute to blockage and added resistance within solution-delivery pathways [2]. Such restrictions matter because they can alter the behaviour of one branch relative to the others, even where the original layout was similar. Distribution imbalance may therefore arise from fixed differences, such as path length and elevation, or from developing differences, such as fouling and obstruction. This paper explains how resistance and pathway differences redistribute flow across parallel branches. It also considers defensible approaches to assessing uniformity without assuming that a common hardware configuration will produce comparable delivery in every operating context.

II. Background and Scope

Uniformity assessment has traditionally drawn on measured discharge, clogging indicators and performance indices. Irrigation literature directly addresses distribution, clogging and performance measures without treating one configuration as universally appropriate [3]. This approach is useful because it distinguishes the observation of variation from the explanation of variation. A metric can show that delivery differs across outlets, but it does not itself identify whether the difference is associated with blockage, elevation, pathway length or another condition. The value of any uniformity measure depends on whether it is applied to representative positions in the delivery network and whether the conditions of measurement are recorded clearly.

Hydroponic flow conditions also depend on channel and root-zone features. Research on nutrient film technique identifies geometry, slope, flow behaviour and root-mat obstruction as relevant factors [4]. These influences clarify why parallel root zones supplied from the same source need not receive equivalent flow. Channels can differ in their physical form and alignment, while root growth can introduce local obstruction during operation. The hydraulic significance of a pathway is therefore not fixed solely by the design drawing. It is shaped by the pathway as installed and by its condition while plants are growing. This creates a need for assessment that considers both structural differences and changes that occur over time.

Closed soilless systems require spatially aware monitoring because a single measurement location can misrepresent conditions elsewhere in the root zone. Evidence on root-zone engineering emphasises sensor location, measurement frequency, system context and multi-parameter reporting, while recognising that architecture constrains transferability [5]. This evidence supports a broader analytical boundary for delivery balance: reservoir-level information cannot by itself demonstrate equal conditions across parallel branches. Measurements must be related to the channels, emitters or root zones that they represent. The unresolved practical question is not whether one index or device is universally sufficient, but whether the assessment captures the hydraulic variation relevant to the particular system.

III. Core Concepts and Mechanisms

The principal mechanism of distribution imbalance is that parallel pathways can experience different pressure and re-

sistance conditions. Emitter-discharge evidence demonstrates that elevation and position can be associated with unequal discharge along a lateral [1]. In a shared supply network, the source solution is common, but the route between source and outlet may not be equivalent for every branch. Differences in elevation alter the relevant head condition, and differences in position may coincide with pressure variation along the pathway. The resulting flow distribution is therefore determined by the hydraulic behaviour of individual branches rather than by the reservoir alone. This mechanism directly explains why common supply does not guarantee equal nutrient-solution delivery.

Resistance is also affected by the material and biological condition of the delivery path. The available evidence directly supports added resistance from biofilms and suspended solids, while nutrient film technique research identifies root-mat obstruction as a hydraulic influence [2], [4]. These forms of restriction can make a pathway behave differently from an otherwise similar neighbouring branch. The implication is that delivery balance should be treated as an operating condition, not merely an initial design property. A system may appear balanced when first commissioned yet become uneven as deposits accumulate or root growth changes the effective pathway. Assessment should therefore be capable of detecting change rather than relying solely on initial layout assumptions.

Substrate hydraulic behaviour provides complementary, but limited, evidence for understanding local root-zone differences. Soilless cultivation research describes hydraulic behaviour under different substrate conditions, although it does not directly establish resistance differences in delivery paths [6]. This distinction is important: variation within a root-zone environment should not be conflated automatically with unequal upstream discharge. Nevertheless, it reinforces the need to separate reservoir conditions, pathway delivery and local root-zone behaviour when interpreting plant-level differences. A sound explanation of unequal supply should first establish whether branch delivery varies, then consider how the receiving root-zone environment may affect the consequences of that variation.

IV. Evidence Synthesis

The strongest direct evidence for unequal flow concerns actual discharge behaviour. Drip fertigation research links pressure and elevation variation with uneven emitter discharge and uses discharge-uniformity concepts to evaluate the resulting hydraulic condition [1]. This evidence establishes the central causal proposition: parallel outlets supplied from a common source can deliver different amounts when their local hydraulic circumstances differ. Nutrient film technique evidence extends the pathway perspective by identifying slope, geometry, flow behaviour and root-mat obstruction as relevant influences [4]. Together, these sources support a pathway-based explanation of delivery imbalance without claiming that a single physical cause dominates all hydroponic systems.

The supporting literature places this explanation within the wider context of system architecture. Soilless-system reviews provide relevant context for monitoring and system-specific management, but do not supply a direct, hardware-agnostic test of hydraulic uniformity [7]. Root-zone engineering evidence similarly connects hydraulic constraints, flow rate, root morphology and nutrient delivery, while remaining incomplete with respect to elevation and blockage as causes of unequal branch discharge [5]. These boundaries should be retained in interpretation. Broad root-zone evidence can explain why hydraulic conditions matter, but direct claims about uneven branch delivery should rest on evidence that measures discharge or identifies pathway-specific hydraulic drivers.

Uniformity should be evaluated from actual hydraulic behaviour rather than inferred from shared infrastructure. This is consistent with emitter-discharge evidence and with controlled-environment research showing that spatial uniformity requires calibrated measurement and explicit consideration of species, cultivar and environmental context [1], [8]. The latter evidence concerns light rather than solution flow and should not be treated as hydraulic proof. Its value lies in the assessment principle: a spatial measurement is meaningful only when its method, location and biological context are stated. For nutrient delivery, a summary index is strongest when paired with information about the relevant outlets, pathway differences and operating state of the system.

V. Practical Implications and Limitations

A defensible assessment of delivery balance begins with comparison across the parallel paths that supply the plants of interest. Relevant observations include discharge at representative outlets, pathway position, elevation relationships, channel geometry, slope and visible signs of obstruction [1], [4]. Distribution and clogging measures can support this comparison by describing the extent and pattern of variation [3]. The purpose is not to prescribe one configuration, but to determine whether the delivery network behaves comparably at the points where plants receive solution. Repeated observations are especially important where biofilms, suspended solids or root mats may change resistance over time [2].

Measurement results require careful limits. Nutrient-management literature discusses solution monitoring and management constraints, but provides limited direct support for physical path resistance [9]. Likewise, general soilless-system literature offers useful context but does not provide a universal method for evaluating distribution uniformity [7]. These limits mean that reservoir measurements, solution chemistry and a single sensor reading should not be treated as conclusive evidence of balanced delivery. Validation requires measurements that represent multiple branches and explicit reporting of sensor placement, sampling frequency and pathway conditions [5]. This reporting enables results to be interpreted within the architecture that produced them.

The available evidence does not justify a universal ranking of elevation, resistance, blockage or path length across all hydroponic designs. Direct emitter evidence arises from a particular fertigation arrangement, and nutrient film technique evidence identifies influential channel factors without proving

identical effects in every system [1], [4]. The appropriate conclusion is therefore conditional. These factors are defensible causes to investigate when plants receive unequal solution, but their importance must be verified in the system under examination. Architecture-specific monitoring and transparent reporting provide a stronger basis for intervention than transferring a result from a different delivery layout [5].

VI. Conclusion

Plants supplied from the same reservoir can receive unequal nutrient solution because parallel pathways may differ in pressure, elevation, position, length, slope, geometry or obstruction. Direct evidence identifies pressure and elevation variation as causes of unequal emitter discharge, while hydroponic evidence identifies channel and root-mat conditions that can alter flow behaviour [1], [4]. Shared supply is therefore not equivalent to equal delivery. Distribution uniformity should be assessed through direct measurement of relevant branches, supported by clogging indicators, spatially appropriate monitoring and explicit reporting of pathway context [3], [5]. The highest-value next work is repeated, pathway-specific validation under actual operating conditions, particularly where deposits or root growth may alter resistance over time.

Acknowledgment

The author used artificial intelligence tools to assist with manuscript drafting and revision, and with LaTeX and bibliography preparation. The author reviewed all AI-assisted output and remains responsible for the final content.

References

[1] O. T. Faloye, S. I. Samuel, A. A. Okunola, V. Kamchoom, N. Sinsamutpadung, and O. Adeyeri, "Simulation of emitter discharge along drip laterals under drip fertigation system using artificial neural network," *PLOS One*, 2025.

[2] I. Szekely and M. H. Jijakli, "Bioponics as a promising approach to sustainable agriculture: A review of the main methods for producing organic nutrient solution for hydroponics," *Water*, 2022.

[3] G. W. Anyangoa, G. D. Bhowmicka, and N. S. Bhattacharyab, "A critical review of irrigation water quality index and water quality management practices in micro-irrigation for efficient policy making," *Desalination and Water Treatment*, 2024.

[4] S. Scott and C. Villouta, "Dissolved oxygen limitation and pythium root rot in strawberry nft systems: Mechanisms, research gaps, and prospects for substrate-free production," *Frontiers in Plant Science*, 2026.

[5] M. T. Naseem and W. Zaman, "Root-zone engineering in closed soilless horticulture: From plant physiology to sensor-guided control," *Horticulturae*, 2026.

[6] A. Tuxun, Y. Xiang, Y. Shao, J. E. Son, M. Yamada, S. Yamada, K. Tagawa, B. Baiyin, and Q. Yang, "Soilless cultivation: Precise nutrient provision and growth environment regulation under different substrates," *Plants*, 2025.

[7] M. Elakrouch, M. Mohaddab, A. Rachid, and M. H. Jijakli, "Soilless agriculture at a crossroads: Strengths, challenges, and prospects of hydroponics, aquaponics, and bioponics in relation to precision farming," *Sustainability*, 2026.

[8] S. Azizi, S. Aliniaeifard, S. Zarbakhsh, S. Esmaeili, K. Baghalian, and N. S. Gruda, "Photobiology, photosynthesis, and plant responses under artificial lighting in controlled environment agriculture," *Scientia Horticulturae*, 2025.

[9] E. Fathidarehnijeh, M. Nadeem, M. Cheema, R. Thomas, M. Krishnapillai, and L. Galagedara, "Current perspective on nutrient solution management strategies to improve the nutrient and water use efficiency in hydroponic systems," *Can. J. Plant Sci*, 2024.